

REMARKS

The Office Action dated November 17, 2004 has been reviewed and carefully considered. Claims 1-14 remain pending in this case, claims 1 and 8 being the independent claims. Claim 1 is amended for clarity to conform to language in claim 8, and claim 8 is not amended. Reconsideration of the above-identified application, as amended and in view of the following remarks, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,449,479 to Sanchez.

The reply to the previous Office Action adequately traverses this rejection.

With regard to claim 8, Sanchez fails to disclose or suggest the next-to-last transmitting step and the preceding transmitting step. In particular, that preceding step recites, "transmitting from said HLR to said ASP a response message, said response message includes said updated information." The next-to-last transmitting step recites, "transmitting from said ASP to a visitor location register (VLR) . . . said updated information received from said HLR."

Instead, Sanchez relies on a conventional QUALDIR (col. 4, line 61) in a single transmission to provide "said updated information" of claim 8. A conventional QUALDIR does not, as in the present invention, travel from the "HLR to said ASP" and

then “from said ASP to a visitor location register (VLR).” The conventional QUALDIR travels instead directly from the HLR to the VLR. Moreover, it appears that step 300 in Sanchez corresponds to the arrival of the conventional QUALDIR and respective update of the VLR, this update being communicated to the MSC which, in turn, notifies the subscriber (step 310). In any event, Sanchez fails to disclose or suggest the next-to-last transmitting step and the preceding transmitting step of claim 8.

Additionally, although the present Office Action suggests that Sanchez “inherently” discloses the claimed role of the Access Switching Process (ASP), “inherency” implies that the function could not be carried out in any other way.

For at least all of the above reasons, claim 8 distinguishes patentably over Sanchez.

Claim 1 has been amended for clarity to recite, “transmitting from said HLR to an Access Switching Processor (ASP) of said originating MSC a response message responsive to said request message, said response message includes updated information of said subscriber.” Support for the amendment of claim 1 is found in claim 8.

Sanchez, by contrast, transmits a conventional QUALDIR from the HLR to the MSC/VLR (col. 4, lines 59-62).

In addition, Sanchez fails to disclose or suggest the claim 1 feature that

relates to the ASP. Accordingly, Sanchez fails to anticipate the invention as recited in claim 1.

As a general guide, although Sanchez discloses an MSC/VLR communicating with an HLR through a signal including predetermined information, Sanchez fails to disclose or suggest an HLR transmitting a feature request including profile information of an updated subscriber, i.e., QUALCODE to an ASP, so that a MSC commands a VLR to directly update an additional service.

Claims 1-6, 8-9, 11-12 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,330,445 to Skog et al. ("Skog").

As to claim 8, it recites, "transmitting . . . a request message to change the additional service information of said subscriber; updating said additional service information by said HLR in response to said request message" as well as three additional transmitting steps. Skog fails to disclose or suggest this feature of claim 8.

The Office Action cites to an Update Location Information command (Skog, col. 6, lines 35-40) with reference to the request message and the updating step of present claim 8. However, this command is conventionally sent whenever "a mobile station enters a new location area" (Skog, col. 6, lines 33-34). The command reports the subscriber's location, but this does not provide proper basis upon which to characterize the conventional Update Location Information command as "a request message to

change the additional service information of said subscriber." Accordingly, it is unclear what the Office Action deems in Skog to correspond to the subsequent transmitting steps of claim 8. The Office Action is silent on this.

In addition, the protocol claim 8 recites with respect to the ASP is neither disclosed nor suggested in Skog.

As to claim 1, Skog fails to disclose the claimed protocol or the inventive aspect relating to the ASP.

With regard to claims 1 and 8, item 6 of the Office Action suggests that "Skog et al. disclose all the subject matters described above." However, the analysis set forth above with regard to the prior ground for rejection traverses this suggestion by the Office Action.

For at least all of the above reasons, Skog fails to anticipate the present invention as recited in claims 1 and 8.

Claims 7, 10 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Skog in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,385,461 to Raith.

Raith relates to group call service, but cannot make up for the shortcomings of Skog. Accordingly, the proposed Skog/Raith combination fails to render obvious the present invention as recited in claims 7, 10 and 13.

As to the other rejected claims, each depends from a respective base claim

Amendment
Serial No. 09/653,145

Docket No. 5000-1-125

that has been shown to be patentable, and is likewise deemed to be patentable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that this application is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned in the event of any perceived outstanding issues so that passage of the case to issue can be effected without the need for a further Office Action.


Amendment
Serial No. 09/653,145

Docket No. 5000-1-125

In the event that any additional fee is required to continue the prosecution of this Application as requested, please charge such fee to Deposit Account No. 502-470.

Respectfully submitted,

CHA & REITER

By: 
Attorney for Applicant

Date: 1/24/05

Mail all correspondence to:
Steve S. Cha
CHA & REITER
210 Route 4 East, #103
Paramus, NJ 07652
Phone: (201) 226-9245
Fax: (201) 226-9246

Certificate of Mailing Under 37 CFR 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313 on 1/24/05.

Steve Cha, Reg. No. 44,069
(Name of Registered Rep.)


(Signature and Date)